IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 2974 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Yuvraj Dharma Nikam..... ..... Respondent.

-: ALONG WITH :-

WRIT PETITION NO. 2975 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Smt. Medha A. Katti..... ..... Respondent.

-: ALONG WITH :-

WRIT PETITION NO. 2976 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Tukaram Gayababu Cholke... ..... Respondent.

-: ALONG WITH :-

WRIT PETITION NO. 2977 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Narsing Dalpatsing Rathod... ..... Respondent.

-: ALONG WITH :-

WRIT PETITION NO. 2978 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Nandkishore Vishwanath Palve... ..... Respondent.

-: ALONG WITH :-

WRIT PETITION NO. 2979 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Ankush S. More..... ... . Respondent.

-: ALONG WITH :-

WRIT PETITION NO. 2980 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra & Ors..... Petitioner.

Versus

Arvind Dnyandeo Patil... ... . Respondent.

Mr. S.K.Chinchlikar, AGP for the Petitioners.

Mr. M. S. Karnik for the Respondents.

CORAM : V.G. PALSHIKAR, and
V.R.KINGAONKAR, JJ.

DATED : 2ND MAY 2006.

P.C.:

By these petitions, the Government of Maharashtra has challenged the orders passed by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal.

2. The challenge obviously is belated. It is almost four years after the orders are passed and implemented in some of the cases.

3. We have perused the orders impugned and it is obvious from the same that the Tribunal has come to the conclusion that no misconduct is proved and therefore imposition of penalty is set aside. The finding is clear, it reads as under:

> "8. The main difficulty of implementing the letter was that the amounts deposited in various Co-operative Banks will have to be withdrawn. Thereby there would be financial loss of interest which either the Government or the Maharashtra Co-operative Society Bank should borne. In any case, therefore, the facts remain that the existing practice was continued. Thereafter the circulars, resolutions were issued by the Government on 21.12.1994 and again on 21.3.1995. It is a common ground that after the G.R. atleast the present applicant had complied the same in as much as while he was posted as Chairman, he appears to have deposited the investment either in Reserve Bank or in any

Nationalised Bank."

4. In such circumstances, it is obvious that no jurisdictional or legal error is committed by the Tribunal in passing the impugned orders. Hence, petitions are dismissed.

-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-